UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,944	04/20/2000	Stephane G. Plante	2410	5687

7590 09/02/2004

Law office of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC
704 228th Avenue N.E.
Ste 193
Sammamish, WA 98074

EXAMINER	
DU, THUAN N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/552,944	PLANTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuan N. Du	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 13-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 13-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5, 6*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: IDSs (dated 9/29/03 and 3/8/04), Amendment A (dated 6/10/04).

2. Claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled. Claims 24-37 have been added.

3. Claims 1-10 and 13-37 are presented for examination.

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: missing a period at the end of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-10 and 13-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admission of Prior Art [AAPA] and Jue (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,931).

7. Regarding claim 1, AAPA teaches a method comprising the steps of:

determining from a set of possible events at least one wake event directed to waking a computer system [application' specification, p. 2, line 13 to p. 3, line 4];

enabling each wake event via software to cause a method to be run for each wake event having an associated method [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-13]; and

re-enabling each wake event such that the software controls whether to rerun any method associated with any wake event signaling that its associated method is to be run [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-14].

AAPA does not explicitly teach the wake event is selectively enabled/re-enabled. In other word, AAPA does not teach the step of enabling *only* a *selected* wake event.

Jue teaches a method for preventing false remote system wake events comprising the step of preventing wake events received remotely after an invalid shutdown event [col. 4, lines 37-41; col. 5, lines 22-59]. In other word, Jue teaches that enabling *only* a *selected* (standard wake command) wake event after an invalid shutdown event [col. 6, lines 11-18].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of AAPA to enable/re-enable only a selected wake event as taught by Jue. The modification would increase the reliability of the system because false wake events will not be selected to wake up the system.

8. Regarding claim 2, Jue teaches that determining at least one event includes accessing information provided in system firmware [col. 5, lines 22-28].

9. Regarding claim 3, AAPA teaches that enabling each wake event includes writing at least one bit to a register location [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-11].

10. Regarding claim 4, Jue teaches that enabling wake event (standard wake command) includes not enabling the wake event (remote wake event) when the system is in a running state (power resumed, system reboot) [col. 5, lines 32-49].

11. Regarding claim 5, Jue teaches that enabling wake event includes enabling the wake event when the system is entering a sleep state [col. 4, line 16].

12. Regarding claim 6, Jue teaches that enabling wake event includes enabling the wake event when the system is entering a low power state [col. 4, lines 16-17].

13. Regarding claim 7, AAPA teaches that determining at least one wake event includes determining a shared wake and run-time event, and enabling each wake event includes enabling the shared event, and handling the shared event as a run-time event when the system is in a running state and as a wake event when the system had been in a sleeping state [application' specification, p. 1, line 19 to p. 2, line 5].

14. Regarding claim 8, AAPA teaches the step of receiving a signal corresponding to an enabled event, and causing execution of a method in response to the signal [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-14, 17-18].

15. Regarding claim 9, AAPA teaches the step of receiving a signal corresponding to an enabled event, and waking the device in response to the signal [application' specification, p. 2, lines 17-24].

16. Regarding claim 10, AAPA teaches the step of receiving a signal corresponding to an enabled event, and waking the system in response to the signal [application' specification, p. 2, lines 17-24].

17. Regarding claim 24, AAPA and Jue together teach the claimed method steps. Therefore, AAPA and Jue together teach the computer-executable instructions for carrying out the claimed method steps.

18. Regarding claims 13-19, AAPA and Jue together teach the claimed method steps. Therefore, AAPA and Jue together teach the apparatus to implement the claimed method steps.

19. Regarding claims 20-23, AAPA and Jue together teach the claimed method steps. Therefore, AAPA and Jue together teach the data structure for carrying out the claimed method steps.

20. Regarding claim 25, AAPA teaches a method comprising the steps of:

receiving a wake event via hardware [application' specification, p. 2, lines 17-18];

running a method associated with the wake event [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-13]; and

after completion of the method, determining in software whether the wake event requires re-enablement, and if so, re-enabling the wake event [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-14].

AAPA does not explicitly teach the wake event is selectively enabled/re-enabled. In other word, AAPA does not teach the step of enabling *only* a *selected* wake event.

Jue teaches a method for preventing false remote system wake events comprising the step of preventing wake events received remotely after an invalid shutdown event [col. 4, lines 37-41; col. 5, lines 22-59]. In other word, Jue teaches that enabling *only* a *selected* (standard wake command) wake event after an invalid shutdown event [col. 6, lines 11-18].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of AAPA to enable/re-enable only a selected wake event as taught by Jue. The modification would increase the reliability of the system because false wake events will not be selected to wake up the system.

21. Regarding claim 26, Jue teaches that identifying the wake up event by accessing information provided via system firmware [col. 5, lines 22-28].

22. Regarding claim 27, AAPA teaches that re-enabling each wake event includes writing at least one bit to a register location [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-14].

23. Regarding claim 28, Jue teaches that enabling wake event (standard wake command) including not enabling the wake event (remote wake event) when the system is in a running state (power resumed, system reboot) [col. 5, lines 32-49].

24. Regarding claim 29, Jue teaches that enabling wake event includes enabling the wake event when the system is entering a sleep state [col. 4, line 16].

25. Regarding claim 30, Jue teaches that enabling wake event includes enabling the wake event when the system is entering a low power state [col. 4, lines 16-17].

26. Regarding claim 31, AAPA teaches that wake event shares a hardware register location with a run-time event, handling an event at that location as a run-time event when the system is in a running state and as a wake event when the system had been in a sleeping state [application' specification, p. 1, line 19 to p. 2, line 5].

27. Regarding claim 32, AAPA and Jue together teach the claimed method steps. Therefore, AAPA and Jue together teach the computer-executable instructions for carrying out the claimed method steps.

28. Regarding claim 33, AAPA teaches a method comprising the steps of:

identifying a shared event comprising a wake event shared with a run-time event [application' specification, p. 1, line 19 to p. 2, line 5];

enabling the shared event [application' specification , p. 2, lines 17-24];

determining whether the shared event is to be re-enabled, and if so, re-enabling the shared event [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-14].

AAPA does not explicitly teach the wake event is selectively enabled/re-enabled. In other word, AAPA does not teach the step of enabling *only* a *selected* wake event.

Jue teaches a method for preventing false remote system wake events comprising the step of preventing wake events received remotely after an invalid shutdown event [col. 4, lines 37-41; col. 5, lines 22-59]. In other word, Jue teaches that enabling *only* a *selected* (standard wake command) wake event after an invalid shutdown event [col. 6, lines 11-18].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of AAPA to enable/re-enable only a selected shared event as taught by Jue. The modification would increase the reliability of the system because false wake events will not be selected to wake up the system.

29. Regarding claim 34, Jue teaches that identifying the shared event by accessing information provided via system firmware [col. 5, lines 22-28].

30. Regarding claim 35, AAPA teaches that enabling shared event includes writing to a software register location [application' specification, p. 3, lines 10-14].

31. Regarding claim 36, AAPA teaches that handling the shared event as a run-time event when the system is in a running state and as a wake event when the system had been in a sleeping state [application' specification, p. 1, line 19 to p. 2, line 5].

32. Regarding claim 37, AAPA and Jue together teach the claimed method steps. Therefore, AAPA and Jue together teach the computer-executable instructions for carrying out the claimed method steps.

Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan N. Du whose telephone number is (703) 308-6292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne H. Browne can be reached on (703) 308-1159.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

The fax number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Thuan N. Du
August 31, 2004